



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE 'ORDER' OF THE LUKAN INTERPOLATIONS

## III THE LONGER INTERPOLATION, LK. 9:51-18:14

B. W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

Our survey of the shorter Lukan Interpolation<sup>1</sup> is not encouraging to the hope of finding pre-Lukan connections in the embodied source material. In Lk. 6:20-8:3 we could discover little as to sources beyond the bare fact that in  $\mathfrak{S}$  as elsewhere a series of incidents illustrative of the Effect produced by Jesus' work as a teacher and healer probably followed upon the account of his preaching. The anecdotes of Lk. 7 appeared to be a selection not in the original order, but in a sequence formed by  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  for pragmatic reasons of his own. Such a result in a section descriptive of the results of Jesus' ministry could hardly be reached if  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  had before him a narrative of the ministry like Mk.'s and respected it. We have indeed seen reason to believe that  $\mathfrak{S}$  had its outline of Jesus' career and fate; but neither Mt. nor Lk. has preserved any considerable trace of it. This might be due to an exaggerated respect for the outline of Mk., leading to the destruction of conflicting orders, or it might be due to the absence of well-defined order in  $\mathfrak{S}$ . It might be due to both causes in varying proportion. Whatever the reason, the fact is apparent in Lk. 6:20-8:3, and predisposes us to expect little from 9:51-18:14.

In point of fact the few and brief statements interspersed in this long section ostensibly to orientate the reader as to time, place and circumstance, are for the most part notoriously of a character both superficial and artificial. A journey to Jerusalem begins at 9:51, apparently the journey referred to in Mk. 9:30-32; 10:1, 32-34, 46, for it ends with the Triumphal Entry. But the journey has no real effect upon the contents of the section. All the incidents and sayings down to the point

<sup>1</sup> See the preceding articles: I "General Survey," Vol. XXXIV, pp. 166-179; and "The Smaller Interpolation," Vol. XXXVI, pp. 112-139.

(18:15) where connection is resumed with the Markan outline, would have just the same course if no journey were taking place, and could be related in about the same words if the occasion were understood to be some other part of the supposed journey, or outside it altogether. From time to time the journey-rubric is perfunctorily repeated. In 10:38 we have "Now, as they went on their way"; in 13:22, "And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching and journeying on to Jerusalem"; in 17:11, "As they were on the way to Jerusalem." But the supposed change of place has no effect on the progress of thought, which advances quite irrespective of the rubric. Indeed the very phraseology of the rubric is discovered to be drawn from the incorporated material when we compare 13:22 with ver. 33 on the one side, and with the preceding data (9:52, 56; 10:1, 10, 12) on the other.

The verdict of critics accordingly is practically unanimous that the so-called "Peraean Journey" of Lk. 9:51-18:14 is a mere artificial framework, constructed by  $\mathfrak{L}^{\text{Lk.}}$  on the basis of Mk. for the purpose of stitching together the great mass of  $\mathbb{Q}$  material here collected in an order which certainly has no intrinsic claim to be considered historical. Moffatt declares that Lk. 9:51-18:14

is not a travel narrative; although it contains some incidents of travel (9:51-56, 57-62; 10:38 f.; 13:22 f.; 14:25 f.; 17:11 f.), these do not dominate the general situation. . . . The setting and juxtaposition of the contents are topical and literary, not chronological. . . . Thus the section is neither (so Schaarschmidt, *SK.*, 1909, 12-28) a fragment of some independent gospel, which covers (though with more definiteness in its setting) the same ground as Mt. 12:15-24:51 = Mk. 3:7-13:37, nor an independent source (P. Ewald, Renan, Burton), nor (Wendt) a block of material from  $\mathbb{Q}$  which Lk. has inserted here (as in 6:20-8:3), but (cf. Wright, *N. T. Problems*, 23-39) a collection of sayings and stories, partly drawn from the Judean ministry of Jesus, partly from  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and partly even from Mk.<sup>2</sup>

Wernle, who gives keen consideration to the question of sequences in Lk. 9:51-18:14 can see a missionary motive more

<sup>2</sup> *Introd. to N. T. Lit.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 273 f. Moffatt's verdict is in general sound, but his reference to *Markan* elements in the Longer Interpolation should be reconsidered in the light of the careful study of this question by Sir J. C. Hawkins in *Oxford Studies* ("St. Lk.'s Use of St. Mk.'s Gospel," pp. 41 ff., 53).

or less dominant in 9:51-10:42, and thinks 12:54-13:35 may be grouped as Warnings to Repent addressed to the Jews. In 14:1-24 we have a Banquet-group. But Wernle soon gives up the attempt to find reasons for the collocations, and frankly pronounces 17:1-19 a mere catch-all of remainders.<sup>3</sup> Professor Burton, of Chicago, though he desires to regard this section of Lk. as derived much as it stands from a single source, and though he would even employ the designation "Peraean Document" for the source, admits that the designation would be to this extent a misnomer, since we have no reason to think the journey anything more than a literary device of  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  of the nature and derivation above defined. In Burton's own language

The position assigned to it by Lk. is perhaps sufficiently explained by a lack of any definite designation of it as the narrative of a particular period, together with the fact that both this document (Lk. 18: 35[?]<sup>4</sup>; 19: 1) and Mk. (10: 46) recorded an arrival at Jericho, which it was obvious to identify. . . . The simplest view is that Mt. and Lk. both possessed a document substantially identical with Lk. 9: 51-18: 14; 19: 1-28, lacking, however, any indication of the precise period to which the events belonged.<sup>5</sup>

Even the bare outline of the 'Peraean Journey' permits, however, a certain degree of subdivision. After the scene at the village where Jesus is received by Mary and Martha (10:38-42), there is a complete change of subject to discourses which have more and more of the polemic and denunciatory character, ending with eschatological warnings which extend to 13:21. Here a new transition is marked by the resumption of the journey-outline covering material of a varied character down to the story of the Samaritan Leper (17:11-19). After this third and final mention of the journey the Interpolation closes with another Eschatology (17:20-18:8) and a parable (18:9-14) which links it on again to the interrupted story of Mk.

In general outline we may thus use the journey rubric to subdivide the Interpolation into three parts which have each its own distinctive pragmatic value: (§1) The Mission section (9:51-10:42); (§2) the Polemic (11:1-13:21); (§3) the Hortatory and Apologetic (13:22-18:14). These three sub-

<sup>3</sup> See below p. 45.

<sup>4</sup> Lu. 18: 35 is from Mk. 10: 46, so quoted wrongly here by Burton?

<sup>5</sup> *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*, 1904, p. 42 f.

divisions may be surveyed in succession for the purpose of determining such principles as may appear to govern the arrangement of the material, distinguishing so far as possible between intrinsic connections implied by the material itself, and agglutinations of  $\mathfrak{L}^{\text{Lk.}}$ .

1. After 10:42  $\mathfrak{L}^{\text{Lk.}}$  has scarcely maintained even the pretence of adjusting his material to the assumed geographic framework. But the phraseology of this closing incident of the Mission Section when compared with that of 9:52 f., 58; 10:5-10, shows what is in the evangelist's mind in §1.

As they went on their way he *entered into a certain village*: and a certain woman named Martha *received him* into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at the Lord's feet and *heard his word*.

Down to this point the conceptions with which the "Peraean" section began still dominate. The narrator is still mindful that he had begun to relate how Jesus and his messengers were "received," or "not received," in the "cities and villages" to which they came. In 9:57-62 he had related how Jesus and his followers had sought (often vainly) "a place where to lay his head," and in 10:1 ff. how the seventy had been sent two and two "into every city and place whither he himself was about to come." In 10:10 importance still attaches to the direction

Into whatsoever city ye enter and *they receive you* eat &c. . . .  
and if *they receive you not* shake off the dust &c. . . . *He that*  
*heareth you* *heareth me* and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me.

The same motive is still apparent in 10:16, though now the *hearing of the message* begins to be more emphasized. With the Return of the Seventy (10:17-20) the thought swerves still further toward the Authority of the Message, permitting a combination of the Thanksgiving for the Revelation to Babes ( $\mathfrak{L}^{\text{Lk.}}$  10:21 f. = Mt. 11:25-27) with the Congratulation of the Disciples on their Revelation ( $\mathfrak{L}^{\text{Lk.}}$  10:23 f. = Mt. 13:16 f.).<sup>6</sup> The parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25-37) seems at first

<sup>6</sup> Connections *ad vocem* are a constant feature of Lk. and especially prominent in the Longer Interpolation. In many cases the relation is more than a matter of pure assonance, but assonances are so common as to make the inference certain that in the formation of the group the compiler

irrelevant, but is doubtless considered by  $\mathfrak{R}$  to illustrate the hiding of the truth from the wise and prudent and its revelation to "babes," inasmuch as the questioning "lawyer" is bidden to "Go, learn" what is really pleasing to God at the feet of the humane Samaritan rather than from the unfeeling priest or Levite. Priests and Levites, the traditional exemplars of right conduct, are inferior as teachers of the law to a very Samaritan, if they lack the gospel motive of loving-kindness. Such is the point of connection with the Thanksgiving for the Revelation given to Babes and Congratulation on the Message (10:21-24).

The original theme of the missionary, his message and his reception comes markedly to the front again in the closing anecdote of the group, Reception by Martha and Mary (10:38-42). The example of Martha who "received Jesus into her house" and especially of Mary who "sat at the Lord's feet and heard his word" are intended to carry a lesson to such as begin to be forgetful to "show hospitality to strangers" and even more to those who begin to "grow dull of hearing." Throughout the division the compiler displays a pragmatic bent which vividly recalls that of the Shorter Interpolation. He is still anxious to commend the example of those who "hear the word of God and do it," though now with special reference to the activity of the travelling evangelist.

We may well agree, therefore, with Moffatt, who voices the opinion of a group of critics in calling Lk. 9:51-10:42

A mirror for Christian missionaries centring round the mission of the seventy; how they are to behave to incivil people (9:51 f.), how they must be whole-hearted (9:57 f.) how they are to carry out their mission (10:1 f.) and how they are to be received.

We are not prepared to admit, however, that

10:25-37 (parable of the Good Samaritan) has no connection with what precedes and very little with what follows.<sup>7</sup>

Moreover we must add a word to explain why the "mirror for Christian missionaries . . . and how they are to be received" should be inserted at this particular point of Mk.

was influenced by purely verbal resemblances. In the present instance note in ver. 17, 20, 21 "with joy," "rejoice not," "rejoice," "he rejoiced." In ver. 21 "hide . . . reveal" as against hiding and revealing in ver. 23 f.

<sup>7</sup> *Introd.*, p. 273; see above, p. 23.

A reference to 9:46-50 (= Mk. 9:33-40) will show that  $\mathfrak{A}$  Lk. takes his point of departure from the Markan agglutination on Receiving ( $\deltaέχεσθαι$ ) vs. Stumbling ( $\sigmaκανδαλίξειν$ ). From 9:1-10 (Mission of the Twelve) onward, its  $\mathfrak{Q}$  parallel (Mission of the Seventy, 10:1-24 = Mt. 10:6-23, 40-42; 11:20-27) had been awaiting employment.  $\mathfrak{S}$  too included the motif "receiving" (Mt. 10:40 f. = Lk. 10:8-11). Mk. 9:37 was therefore the natural point of attachment for this, while its foil in Mk. 9:38-40 (Forbidding the Strange Exorciser) is also quite naturally included in Lk. 9:49 f., because the example of the Intolerance of James and *John* toward the Samaritans who "did not receive him" (Lk. 9:52-56) formed so unmistakable a pendant to it. This anecdote, while it may not have stood first in the source, obviously forms part of the group on "receiving" the preachers of the gospel.

2. At the end of Lk. 10 there is an abrupt change of subject. The journeyings of Master and disciples play no further part, nor is there any further mention of their being "received" or not "received." Not until 13:22 does  $\mathfrak{A}$  Lk. suddenly bethink himself again of the Journey, reminded (it would seem) by the material he incorporates a few verses further on; for a comparison of the editorial rubric 13:22 with ver. 33 will show the origin of its new phrases.<sup>8</sup> But the geographical outline leaves the contents of the new section untouched. The rubric recurs at 17:11 in the form

And it came to pass as they were on the way to Jerusalem.

It seems to be suggested here too by the contents; for the rubric scarcely agrees with the statement in the same verse that

he was passing between Samaria and Galilee.<sup>9</sup>

But we need only continue the sequence of the embodied material to find convincing evidence of an underlying *topical* order, which in spite of interruptions maintains itself quite independently of the Journey order.

The subject of receiving the Lord and his messengers with hospitality and a devout hearing is no sooner completed at the

<sup>8</sup> Cf. "went on his way" with "must go on my way"; "unto Jerusalem" with "out of Jerusalem."

<sup>9</sup> On the rendering and meaning, see Plummer, *Int. Crit. Comm.*, *ad loc.*

end of Ch. 10 than we launch out with 11:1 upon the wholly unconnected subject of Effectual Prayer.

And it came to pass, as he was praying in a certain place that when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, even as John also taught his disciples.

The mode of entrance upon the new subject reminds us of a number of similar beginnings in this section to which Mk. affords but few parallels, and which also fail to appear in Mt., whether because they are constructed by  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$ , or because Mt. in embodying the discourses they introduce as parts of his Sermons finds no room for the narrative outline. Thus in Lk. 12:13, a still longer discourse, again only partially taken up by Mt. into his first Sermon, is introduced by the following brief description of the occasion:

And one out of the multitude said unto him, Master, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me.

A long series of parables and discourses follows on Possessions *vs.* Life, or Wealth that Faileth Not (12:13-34), forming an enclave between the eschatological warnings of 12:1-12 and 35 ff. In Lk. 13:1 warnings of the fate of the unrepentant are introduced by the statement:

Now there were some present at that very season who told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.

So in Lk. 11:27 the interpellation is that of "a certain woman." In 11:45 it is made by "one of the lawyers," in 13:23 by an enquirer who "said unto him, Lord are there few that be saved?" in 14:15 by "one of them that sat at meat<sup>10</sup> with him." Each becomes the occasion of a longer or shorter discourse. Whether this be the habit of  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$  personally, or a method derived from the source, it is at least a sufficiently stereotyped literary form to afford a recognizable characteristic. Moreover the introductions which thus aim to throw light upon the ensuing discourse by brief reference to its occasion are manifestly of a completely different type from the rubrics which aim to bind all the parts of the Longer Interpolation into one

<sup>10</sup> "Sat at meat" is a phrase dictated by the situation described in 14:1. Before the formation of the "Banquet-group" the phrase will have been merely "stood by," or the like. See below, p. 37.



structure as successive incidents of the Markan Journey to Jerusalem (Mk. 10:1 = Lk. 9:51). The two structural plans follow independent lines, as an instance or two will show.

The theme Effectual Prayer introduced in Lk. 11:1 ff. by the method just illustrated had, as we saw, nothing intrinsically to do with the theme of the preceding chapters. Its preface is equally independent of **℔**'s postulated situation of a Peraean journey. But Effectual Prayer is a topic which we might reasonably expect to be discussed at some length in **Σ** if we are correct in believing this source to be related to the Wisdom literature of Palestine and Alexandria; for the Epicurean tendencies so strongly antagonized in Wisdom of Solomon and the editorial portions of Ecclesiastes were fatal to prayer of any vital kind. Even Stoic pantheism afforded none too favorable an atmosphere for real supplication. The Hymn of Cleanthes represents the devoutest summit of pure Stoicism. It is doubtless because of the general tendency of Stoic pantheism to stifle prayer that Diogenes Laertius records of Posidonius of Apamea, the Platonizing reformer of Stoicism, that in his treatise on *Duties* he maintained that "the wise man is continually asking good gifts from God."<sup>11</sup> If so influential a philosopher as Posidonius made the continual supplication of good gifts from God part of the Duties of the Wise Man the question of the efficacy of prayer is not likely to have been left unconsidered among Jewish teachers in Syria and Alexandria who came under his influence. We know it in fact to have been the case with Philo, and it is likely to have been so with others. The intense theism of Judaism could hardly come into contact with Stoic pantheism without collision at this point. Sir. 35: 13-17 and Jas. 5: 13-18 afford further evidence of the occupation of the Wisdom writers with the theme of prayer and its effect.

Be this as it may, the subject thus introduced in Lk. 11:1-13 appears much more fully than in Mt. 6:9-15; 7:7-11. The writer also adopts an argumentative tone quite foreign to the Matthean teaching. The theme ends somewhat abruptly with ver. 13, and quite unexpectedly a new theme begins, for which the way is paved by a textual alteration in this verse. For the context obviously requires the words "good gifts" in the conclusion, and this is the actual reading in Mt. 7:11. But Lk. has

<sup>11</sup> Ο σόφος αἰτούμενος τὰ ἀγαθὰ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν. *Ap. Diogen. Laert.* vii. 124.

How much more shall your heavenly Father give *the Holy Spirit* to them that ask him?

With this change of reading coincides a change of subject. At 11:14 we suddenly pass from that of Effectual Prayer to that of Jewish Opposition. The evangelist proceeds to relate the Blasphemy of the Spirit by those who said "He casteth out by Beelzebub," and this becomes the occasion for a long denunciatory discourse directed first against a generation possessed by "the unclean spirit." In 11:27 f. there is a momentary digression due to a woman's exclamation and the blessing elicited by it on "those that hear the word of God and keep it"; but after this the denunciations continue upon the Unrepentant Generation (11:29-32) and upon those whose eye is evil (33-36). The long polemic closes with Woes upon Pharisees and Scribes (11:37-54), and an Encouragement of the Disciples to Fearless Confession in the face of Persecution with promise of "the Spirit" (12:1-12).

It is worth while to observe that the writer who thus subjoins a long section on the Gift of the Spirit to the section on Effectual Prayer is the same who amends Mk.'s description of Jesus' Baptism with the Spirit by adding (Lk. 3:21) that the Spirit came upon him "as he was praying."

The subdivision extending from Lk. 11:14 to 12:12 may clearly be regarded as a single sequence. It has a consistent polemic aim throughout, and parallels the Woes on Scribes and Pharisees and Doom of the Sanctuary of Mt. 23, 24, in a large part of its contents. In Lk., however, the agglutination as a whole is dominated by the thought of "the Holy Spirit" as the gift of God to the Church. This divine endowment is envied and blasphemed by the scribes, because their eye is evil and their boasted inward light darkness. It is denied by the evil generation that seek a sign (the Jews). But they are now possessed by a seven-fold spirit of evil. The denunciation ends with an Encouragement of the Church to Fearless Confession and the promise of the Paraclete in 12:10-12:

And everyone who shall speak a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven. And when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say.

The compiler who attaches this Warning and Encouragement to the subdivision beginning at 11:14 with the Blasphemy of the Scribes, and who after the enclave on Wealth that Faileth Not (12:13-34) passes to further Eschatological Warnings (12:35-13:21), can only be the same who paves the way for it in 11:13 by changing "Good gifts" to "the Holy Spirit." He is easily recognizable as the writer who in the Book of Acts takes such obvious pains to prove the Church the real people of God by virtue of its endowment with the Spirit. In Acts "gifts of the Spirit" are the divine seal upon the Church's initiatory rite; the power and wisdom of the Spirit are the special investiture of its apostles and evangelists, making them able to "stand before governors and kings." The sources of the book reflect, of course, in this respect the profoundest conviction of the primitive Church, as marked in the Pauline Epistles as anywhere (Rom. 8; Gal. 3:1-4:7). The compiler is of course the same  $\mathfrak{L}^k$  as here. Moreover in Acts also  $\mathfrak{L}^k$  has improved upon his sources, introducing clauses in Acts 1:2 and 4:25 which bring in the action of "the Holy Ghost" even to the complete confusion of the grammatical construction. He seems to be intent on showing that Israel is no longer the people of revelation. So in Lk. 11:1-13:21, those who have the sign of Jonah, the preaching of the Son of man, and have repented at it put to shame the "evil generation," whose boasted cleanness is mere outward observance. The new people of God are the followers of the martyred Prophet. The proof appealed to in both cases is that

The Spirit and the gifts are ours  
Through him who with us sideth.

We judge, then, that the appending of the long polemic agglutination Lk. 11:14-12:12 after the  $\mathfrak{Q}$  discourse on Effectual Prayer in Lk. 11:1-11, is due to  $\mathfrak{L}^k$ . The motive for the present arrangement is (as in the Shorter Interpolation) pragmatic and apologetic rather than historical. Lk. is preacher first and conservator of sources only incidentally. After the theme of Hearing the Word he passes naturally to that of Praying and Receiving (or Rejecting) the Spirit.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the interjection of prayer before Jesus' reception of the Spirit in 3:21 = Mk. 1:11.

Much of the subdivision beginning with 11:14 (Blasphemy of the Scribes) is paralleled in Mt. 12:22-50 and Mt. 23 f., to say nothing of connections with Mk. 7 and Mk. 12:38-13:37.

As noted above, the Beelzebub section (11:14-12:12) is one of those most exposed to relocation because of the transposition effected by Mk. Unfortunately its removal from after Lk. 11:13 does not restore the sequence of  $\S$ <sup>13</sup>; for Lk. 12:13 only introduces the new subject of Wealth that Failleth Not. This new theme is introduced after the plan of which examples have already been cited:

And one out of the multitude said unto him, Master, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me. But he said unto him, Man, who made me a judge, or a divider over you? And he began to say unto them, Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth.

But what to the compiler was the connection of this discourse on Wealth with the Warning to Fearless Confession (12:1-12) on the one side, and the Eschatology (12:35-13:9) on the other?

To  $\mathfrak{Lk}$ , the setting of the discourse on Wealth that Failleth Not between the Exhortation to Fearless Confession (12:1-12) and that to Watchfulness for the Coming (12:35-48) doubtless seemed appropriate because the whole sequence had an eschatological application. Those who had been warned that their life and liberty would be assailed (12:4-12) were now to be warned to "take joyfully the spoiling of their goods." Moreover the reference to the treasure laid up in heaven "where no *thief draweth near*" (12:33) recalled the warning to watch as for the *coming of a thief* (ver. 39). This subject of Watchfulness for the Coming is continued by a series of kindred eschatological warnings down to the pair of parables likening "the kingdom of God" to a Mustard-seed and the Leaven (13:18-21). For these two parables, removed by Lk. from their Markan connection in the section on Hearing the Word and Doing it (6:12-8:21), are regarded by him, after Mk.'s example, as eschatological in bearing. He writes the closing words "till it was all leavened" with thoughts in mind like those of Paul

<sup>13</sup> On the probable continuation of the subject Effectual Prayer in the parable of the Importunate Widow (18:1-8) a pendant to that of the Importunate Friend (11:5-8), see below, p. 50.

when he speaks of the triumph of Christ over the last enemy and the ultimate universal and eternal reign of God (I Cor. 15:24-28).

But why interject the incident of the Loosing of the Daughter of Abraham (13:10-17) between the parable of the Barren Fig-tree and the parables of the Mustard-seed and Leaven? At first sight the anecdote appears alien to this eschatological connection; but it probably forms no real exception. Just as Mk. inserts after the Transfiguration the story of an epileptic boy elaborating details with the apparent design of symbolizing the long resistance of Israel to the apostolic preaching, a resistance broken only by the second Coming,<sup>14</sup> so here with the "daughter of Abraham" bound by Satan, "lo, these eighteen years." The liberated woman of Lk. 13:10-17 is probably used by  $\mathfrak{L}^k$  to symbolize the church in Judaea (cf. Mk. 13:14), perhaps even with the date of the Apostolic Council (Acts 15) in mind.

We thus obtain as the probable logical nexus in the mind of  $\mathfrak{L}^k$  when forming §2 of his Longer Interpolation the following outline which follows §1 on Those who Received (or did not receive) the Preachers of Glad Tidings:

§2. The Spirit Given to Sons *vs.* the Unclean Spirit.

1. The Good Part not to be Taken Away.  
11: 1-4, Jesus teaches his Disciples to Pray  
5-13, He assures them of the Gift of the Spirit.
2. The Fate of those who Blaspheme the Spirit.  
11: 14-19, The Charge He casteth out by Beelzebub  
20-26, The Last State of the Unrepentant  
27-28, Blessing on those that hear and keep the word of God.
3. Denunciation of the Evil Generation that seeks a Sign.  
11: 29-32, The Sign of Jonah  
33-36, Inward Light  
37-44, Woes on Pharisees, whose Religion is of the Outside  
45-52, Woes on Scribes, the Blind Guides  
53-54, Editorial Colophon, Traps of the Pharisees.
4. Warnings, and Promise of the Holy Spirit.  
12: 1-3, Beware of the Leaven of Pharisaism  
4-9, Fear not the Persecutor, but confess Christ.  
10-12, Blasphemy *vs.* Aid of the Holy Spirit.
5. Eschatology.  
12: 13-21, Treasure that Fails  
22-34, Treasure in Heaven that Faileth not

<sup>14</sup> See *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, *ad loc.*

- 12: 35-40, Watch for the Coming of the Son of Man  
 41-48, Special Responsibility of Those who 'Watch for your Souls'  
 49-53, The Coming brings Divisions  
 54-59, Signs of the Times  
 13: 1-5, Fate of Galileans and Men of Jerusalem a Token  
 6-9, The Barren Fig-tree  
 10-17, Satan's Bond-maid Released  
 18-21, The Grain of Mustard-seed and Leaven of God.

From the point of view of  $\mathfrak{Lk}$ , accordingly, 11:1-13:21 appears to form a continuous eschatological whole.

But intrinsically the discourse on Wealth that Faileth Not is *not* eschatological. It merely follows the accustomed lines of Stoic teaching, regarding life or happiness as superior to external conditions. The general theme as expressed in 12:15 and developed in the successive illustrations is paralleled at many points by the Stoic doctrine of the inner life as the substance, externals incidental and adaptable, in the form which this doctrine assumed in Jewish Wisdom. The 'Epicurean'<sup>15</sup> Solomon of Ecclesiastes appears in the discourse as the highest example of unwisdom. He is the "fool" who knew no more of that wherein "a man's life consisteth" than to build greater and greater store-chambers and barns, and to say to his soul, "Soul, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry." In fact the fool who heapeth up riches and knoweth not who shall gather them is quite a favorite character with the Wisdom writers (*cf.* Sir. 11:18 f.; 10, 12; 5:1; Jas. 4:13-5:6). The discourse of Lk. 12:13-34 as originally conceived is as independent of the adjoining eschatological context, as it manifestly is of the editorial scheme of the journey to Jerusalem. Had this been in the mind of the original writer we might expect the opening scene-setting to run somewhat as follows: "And Jesus with his disciples came to a certain city, and on the sabbath he was teaching in the synagogue, as his custom was." There is no evidence in either Mt. or Lk. that the writer of the discourse had any special situation, or course of *events* in mind.

<sup>15</sup> The Jewish conception of the *Epikouros* is simply that of the godless hedonist. Ecclesiastes, the book in which Solomon is represented as following this philosophy, had great difficulty in obtaining its place in the canon, and obtained it only in view of a drastic revision contradicting the main teaching of the book (Eccl. 11:9b; 12:10 f.).

The only sequence is topical. We may indeed be fairly sure that Lk. is more true to the source in preserving the opening scene and parable of the Rich Fool than Mt. in discarding these; for the real theme of the discourse is given in perfectly authentic (non-eschatological) form in 12:15, and the parable itself is clearly presupposed in the subsequent references to "Solomon in all his glory" (cf. Eccl. 2:1-11), and the ravens "which have neither *store-chamber nor barn*; and God feedeth them." The whole block 12:13-34 may well be assigned to  $\mathfrak{S}$  in view of its Matthean parallel. But from what connection  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  derived the discourse which he thus weaves into his eschatological group it is as yet impossible to say. We only note that the long sequence begun at 11:1 reaches its climax with the Release of Satan's Bondmaid (13:10-17)<sup>16</sup> and its close with the pair of Parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven of the Kingdom. The final words "till it was all leavened" carry an echo of triumphant faith. After these a new theme (3) begins with the much-debated question: Are there Few that be Saved? Only a few touches of  $\mathfrak{A}$ 's hand remain for consideration before proceeding to §3.

We have seen (I, p. 178) that the interjection of half of the  $\mathfrak{Q}$  Wisdom-plaint in Lk. 11:49-51 (=Mt. 23:34-35) is certainly due to  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$ . The symmetry of 46-52 is so violently broken by it that we marvel no less at his disregard here for aesthetic form, than in 7:1-10 and 36-50 for chronological sequence. Lk. 11:49-51 must at all events go to join its other half in 13:34-35 whether the two belong there or elsewhere.

Again Lk. 11:53-4 is obviously an editorial link, parallel to (perhaps having literary relation with) Mk. 12:13. But what purpose does link *a* serve, seeing the sayings of 12:1<sup>b</sup>-12 already have their editorial introduction in link *b* = 12:1<sup>a</sup>? It should be followed, as in Mk. 12:13 ff., by some account of the success or failure of the plot; but nothing happens. Moreover link *b* (which merely counts the audience in connection with verses 13 and 41 much after the plan of Acts 1:15; 2:41; 4:4 &c.), if we may draw an inference from Mk.'s curious interpretation of the warning against the Leaven of the Pharisees (Mk. 8:14 ff.), really separates link *a* from its intended connection. According to Mk., the "leaven of the Pharisees" is their secret plotting

<sup>16</sup> On the motive for this location, see above (p. 31).

(with "the Herodians") against Jesus' life.<sup>17</sup> **R**Lk. however has a different interpretation of the *logion* which he inserts quite explicitly in the gloss "which is hypocrisy" (12:1<sup>b</sup>), an explanation as obvious as it is incorrect; for Jesus was surely not warning his disciples against hypocrisy(!) Mk. would seem to have had before him a text which did not include the estimate of numbers in 12:1<sup>a</sup> but passed directly from 11:53-4 (Traps of the Scribes and Pharisees) to 12:1<sup>b</sup>, "And he began to say unto his disciples: First of all beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees." After this followed in **Q** the *logion* on the Revelation of Things Hidden (ver. 2-3 = Mt. 10:26 = Mk. 4:22 = Lk. 8:17); for Mt. also clearly attests its connection with the Exhortation not to fear Persecution (cf. Mt. 10:16-33 with Lk. 12:2-12).

3. At 13:22 **R**Lk. indicates his transition to a new theme by the rubric:

And he went on his way through cities and villages teaching and journeying on to Jerusalem.

The data and phraseology of the rubric (so far as new) are drawn from ver. 33 ("go on my way, . . . Jerusalem"); but the placing of the milestones at this point and again at 17:11a, where they recall the journey-scheme, suggests that **R**Lk. is as it were framing together the intervening material. The sequence is opened by the anti-Jewish sayings on the Rejection of the Sons of Abraham in Favor of Gentile Believers (13:23-30). It is closed by the incident of the Samaritan Leper (17:11b-19). In reality, as we shall see, the opening discourse, so fully in line with the **Q** passage on the Baptist's Preaching "Think not to say unto yourselves, We are Abraham's Children" (Mt. 3:8 f. = Lk. 3:8 f.) actually does lay down the dominant theme of the new section. For in the main, apart from some apparent additions and transpositions which it must be our endeavor to explain, the course of thought throughout is controlled by the idea: Rejection of the Self-styled Elect, Salvation of the Despised and Outcast. To designate this dominant *motif* we may appropriately borrow the language of the opening discourse (ver. 30), calling it the 'Last-first' theme. It is resumed after an interval in 14:15-24.

<sup>17</sup> See *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, *ad loc.*



The interruptions of the sequence are at first puzzling. When we find such apparent transpositions as 16:1-9 from after 12:13-34, and 18:9-14 from after 16:14-16, we cannot wonder that many critics resort to the theory of a third source peculiar to Lk., the interweaving of which might occasion such dislocations. Moffatt's *Introduction* gives in abstract several theories of the kind. But Moffatt himself abandons hope of restoration. He prefers to apply to the agglutinated anecdotes of Lk. in both the Lesser and Greater Interpolations the language of Blair, who speaks of them as consisting of

beds of transplanted flowers, arranged with some degree of skill, and fragrant in their beauty; but as no observer can argue from the appearance of a flower to the soil in which at first it grew, so also the desire of the critic to find for the *logia* their original context appears to be utterly hopeless.<sup>18</sup>

It is not wholly insupposable that **R** might prefer to divide and distribute long discourses in a single source on the more abstract subjects, if he were intent on depicting a varied journey. His aim, then, would doubtless be to fill out the Markan framework by some readjustment of material and thus avoid monotony. But the deliberate breaking up of logical connections in the interest of so very imperfect a narrative scheme must be admitted to be a harsh supposition.

Have we no alternative save the postulation of a third source?

For the present it will suffice to indicate that some dislocations have occurred through supplementation or otherwise, and that in spite of this, a deeper logical connection still survives.

The evangelist's own scheme of arrangement we have already seen to be characterized by a very superficially applied historical and dramatic progress borrowed from Mk., viz., the Peraean Journey, beginning with the Mission of the Seventy (9:51-10:42; 13:31-35; 17:11-19). The Journey scheme is also characterized (as we have just seen) by a deeper-going pragmatic interest which leads to supplementation (by transposition or otherwise) to guard against antinomian misuse (14:25-35; 16:1-13) and moral laxity (12:35-59). Finally **R**<sup>Lk.</sup> seems also to emphasize an anti-Jewish apologetic (11:14-12:12). Of this we have just observed a further instance in

<sup>18</sup> *Op cit.*, p. 276, quoting Blair, *Apostolic Gospel*, p. 157.

13:23-14:35. A differentiation of the underlying logical connection in the  $\textcircled{P}$  material from connections which seem to be made in the interests traceable to the compiler  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$  is our present task.

We have seen two instances in which the source-theme appears to be adopted in its own setting, quite unmodified, only to be diverted later by  $\mathfrak{R}$  into channels of his own making. A third and conspicuous example would appear in 13:23 were it not that the modifying hand of  $\mathfrak{R}$  has here intervened with more than the usual degree of transposition and supplementation. In reality the question "Lord, are they few that be saved?" is intended to propound the subject for discourse after the method employed in the previous cases of Effectual Prayer (11:1-4) and Possessions *vs.* Life or Wealth that Faileth Not (12:13-21). This theme too (the relatively small number of the redeemed) is one of the stock questions of Jewish theodicy, as can be seen from Second Esdras where a large element of the problem is that

The Most High hath made this world for many, but the world to come for few.<sup>19</sup>

Esdras cannot therefore refrain from many "questions concerning the multitude of them that perish." In Lk. 13:23-30; 14:15-24; 15:11-32 the theme is indeed continued, much as in Second Esdras, only that the many that perish are now the self-righteous element of Judaism who reject the invitation, and the few that enter in are the penitent outcasts; so that the keynote becomes a warning not to depend on anything save repentance. Repentance reverses conditions as they are, so that "the last become first."

But this standard theme of Last-first, so consonant with other  $\textcircled{P}$  material (Mt. 3:8 f. = Lk. 3:8) is twice interrupted. (1) The thread is broken after 13:30 by the coming in of two groups of alien material. We have (a) two incidents in which "certain Pharisees" show a veiled hostility to Jesus (13:31-35); (b) two parables concerning banquets (14:7-14). It is no wonder, therefore, that attempt after attempt is made to reconstruct the order. Moffatt, following Wernle, recognizes in 14:1-24 the classical Greek literary device of the symposium-

<sup>19</sup> II Esdr. 8:1.

dialogue. Its three anecdotes were grouped by **A** simply because all spoke of banqueting.<sup>20</sup> A theory that the **Q** parable of the Great Banquet (14:15-24 = Mt. 22:1-10) attracted to itself the three minor anecdotes in 14:1-14 because in each there was mention of banqueting (verses 1, 8, and 12 f.) might account for the prefixing of 14:1-14, and the editorial touch "sat at meat with him" in 14:15. But there is not only difficulty with 14:1-6 (Healing on the Sabbath) whose location here Wernle despairs of interpreting,<sup>21</sup> but with 13:31-35 also; for the parable of the Great Banquet (14:16-24) is *not* entitled to the place Blair would give it "between 13:24 and 13:25."<sup>22</sup> It should follow 13:30. We must of course consider that the words "that sat at meat with him" in 14:15 are dictated by the requirements of the Banquet-group. Cancel this editorial phrase, or substitute "stood by" or the like, and both the reason for the ejaculation "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God" and the point of Jesus' reply become transparently clear. The warning "Strive to enter in by the narrow door" (*i. e.* the brief opportunity of repentance, *cf.* 12:54-59) had issued in Jesus' picture (13:25-30) of the shutting out of those who count on their descent from the patriarchs, while others

come from the east and west, and from the north and south and recline (at banquet) in the kingdom of God. And behold there are last which shall be first and there are first which shall be last.

To this there can be no more natural sequel than 14:15:

And when one of them [that stood by?] heard these things he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.

The parable of the Great Banquet (16-24) then follows with perfect appositeness

But he said unto him, A certain man made a great supper &c.

For the real point of the parable is of course that the guests who were *first* to receive the invitation were displaced by outcasts to whom it was extended *last*.

<sup>20</sup> *Introd. to N. T. Lit.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 273.

<sup>21</sup> *Synopt. Frage.*, p. 100.

<sup>22</sup> Approved by Moffatt *ibid.* "The transference of 14:16-24 to a place between 13:24 and 13:25 (*cf.* Blair's *Apostolic Gospel*, pp. 212 ff.) has several points in its favor. The table-talk, which is a feature of Lk., reflects the Greek symposium-dialogues."

(2) This primary application of the parable is obscured not only by the insertion before it of Lk. 13:31-14:14 but by editorial supplements after it in both Mt. and Lk. Mt. attaches to the parable, as we have seen, a supplement to guard against antinomian misuse (Mt. 22:11-14). But Lk. also meets the same requirement by following it up with saving clauses in 14:25-35, interrupting the connection with 15:1 ff. Moreover Lk. as well as Mt. allegorizes. There is no need, as the Matthean parallel shows, for Lk.'s *two* supplementary sendings of the servant to find new guests. Neither does the point of the parable require that the new comers should be "poor and maimed and blind and lame." These words are copied from the preceding parable (14:13).  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$  has in mind (*a*) the remnant of Israel and (*b*) the ingathering of the Gentiles. Mt. 22:9 f. (save for the redactional clause "both bad and good," which leads over to Mt.'s supplement) gives the authentic form of the parable and makes still more clear its close relation as a whole with 13:23-30.

Why, then, has  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$  allowed this close relation of 13:23-30 with 14:15-24 to be interrupted by the series beginning with Herod's Threat (13:31-35) and continued by the Sabbatarian Controversy (14:1-6) and the two Banquet Sayings (14:7-11, 12-14)? If we say that he was merely forming a 'symposium-group' we obtain but a partial and inadequate answer. Possibly the prefixing of the two Banquet Sayings might be thus accounted for,<sup>23</sup> but the anecdote of sabbatarian controversy in 14:1-6 has no intrinsic connection with banqueting. It has on the contrary so close a relation through the parable of the ox or ass fallen in a pit with Mt. 12:9-14 = Mk. 3:1-6 that there is strong reason to regard the Lukan banquet setting as a mere editorial replica of Lk. 11:37, replacing an original *synagogue* scene corresponding to Mk. 3:1 f. Why, then, is this anecdote made part of the symposium series, to the great detriment of the Last-first connection?

The most reasonable explanation will be found at the point of interruption, if we recall the habitual mode of narration characteristic of this evangelist. We must assume that  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$  is attempting to arrange his material according to a course of

<sup>23</sup> On the prior connection of these and other elements removed see the writer's forthcoming Commentary.

events which he infers from it. In considering the rubric 13:22 we have seen that his scheme is a historical and geographical order, for which the warning of the Pharisees, "Get thee out, and go hence, for Herod would fain kill thee" (13:31) gives the cue. After a warning of the 'turning to the Gentiles' such as 13:28-30 we can expect from  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk}}$  nothing less than plots of the Pharisees to drive the preacher out, for this is with him a stereotyped form (*cf.* 4:25-29, Acts 22:21 f. &c.). Moreover in 11:53 ff. this theme had already been suggested in  $\mathfrak{S}$ . Now as understood by  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk}}$  the saying 13:31-33 (to which he attaches the Wisdom quotation ver. 34 f.) implies precisely the situation required after 13:23-30, a situation of outward friendliness on the part of the Pharisees<sup>24</sup> covering inward hostility. A similar situation appears in the story of the Healing of the Dropsy on the Sabbath (14:1-6), a parallel to the Plot against Jesus' Life by the "Pharisees and Herodians" of Mk. 3:1-6, thus all that was required to make of this story of how "they were watching him" (14:1) a link to connect with the Banquet-group (14:7-24) was an editorial touch, making the occasion similar to that of 11:37, where Jesus was a guest in the house of a Pharisee.

The arrangement of 13:22-30, 31-35; 14:1-6 ff. is therefore only a typical instance of the stereotyped Lukan progress of thought. We have first in 13:23-30 Enunciation of the theme Last-first, ending

And they shall come from the east and west and from the north and south and recline at banquet in the kingdom of God. And behold there are last which shall be first and there are first which shall be last.

Thereupon follows Herod's Threat, and the hostile "watching" of the Pharisees (14:1).

Thus the historically authentic incident of Herod's Threat ( $\mathfrak{S}$  ?) becomes a link to draw in a parallel to Mk.'s story of the plots against Jesus' life (Mk. 3:1-6). This in turn is adjusted to the Banquet-group by the editorial touch in ver. 1,

<sup>24</sup> The curious addition repeatedly made by Mk. to the plots of "the Pharisees" (so the  $\mathfrak{Q}$  warning 11:53, 12:1) of "the Herodians" (Mk. 3:6; 8:15; 12:13) is perhaps explained by Lk. 13:31. Mk. understands this to imply collusion between the Pharisees and members of Herod's court.

making of the whole group 13:22-14:35, the starting-point for a new historico-geographical outline controlling the second half of the Longer Interpolation.

As regards the source of this unique datum of Herod's Threat, and its location in the source we are still in the dark. The Wisdom-quotation which Lk. divides (11:49-51; 13:34 f.) but Mt. holds intact (23:34-39) appears in  $\Theta$  and is connected by both evangelists with the Exhortation to Fearless Confession (Mt. 10:16-39, Lk. 12:2-12). The incident itself looks forward to a briefly impending close of the Galilean ministry. Wellhausen and other critics are doubtless correct in associating it with Mk. 6:14<sup>25</sup>, and (as we have seen) Mk. 8:11-21 brings it into the same sequence as  $\Theta$  (Pharisaic "cleanness" 7:1-23, Generation that Seek a Sign, 8:11-13). In due time the *τάξις* of  $\Sigma$  may be discussed. In the meantime it is clear that the *topical* order of the material in Lk. 13:22 ff. is the Last-first theme, which passes from 13:30 to 14:15 ff. The first two of the intervening sections (13:31-35 and 14:1-11) are introduced here to continue  $\mathfrak{A}$ 's historico-geographic outline; the second pair (14:7-11 and 12-14) are merely banquet-sayings expanding the symposium group.

The second break by  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  is that between 14:15-24 and 15:1 ff. caused by the attachment after the parable of the Great Feast (14:15-24) of the sayings on Counting the Cost (14:25-35). Its motive is identical with that of  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Mt.}}$  for attaching to the same parable with its dangerous suggestion of promiscuous admissions, the supplement regarding the man cast out because he had not on a wedding garment (Mt. 22:11-14). To say "If any man cometh unto me and doth not . . . he cannot be my disciple" with Lk., is only to put in the form of direct address the caveat which Mt. appends in the form of a supplement to the parable. Similar saving clauses are introduced by  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  again in 16:17 f. after the radical saying on the passing of "the law and the prophets." Since the topical sequence Last-first continues in ch. 15, the location here of 14:25-35 may be attributed to the effort of  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  to forestall antinomian misuse. We may call it a parantinomian interest.

Before continuing with the analysis of Lk. 15-17 it may be

<sup>25</sup> See *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, *ad loc.*

well to recall a further clue to the original  $\mathbb{Q}$  sequence derived from the comparison of Mt.<sup>26</sup>

In Mt. 20:1-16 the theme already designated Last-first and pursued thus far in Lk. 13:22-14:35 is fully and explicitly set forth in the parable of the Discontented Laborers (*cf.* 19:30 and 20:16). Now a connection between this parable and that of the Two Sons (Mt. 21:28-31*a*) results automatically so soon as the intervening Markan material (Mt. 20:17-21:27 = Mk. 10:32-11:33) is removed. Mt. and Lk. thus really coincide in continuing the Last-first theme with the parable of the Repentant Younger Son, the principal difference being that Lk. has formed a triad under the rubric (15:1):

Now all the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto him for to hear him. And both the Pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them.

Moreover we need look but a little further on to find in the  $\mathbb{Q}$  fragment Lk. 16:16 = Mt. 11:12-14, a reference to the Repentance of the Publicans and Outcasts at the Preaching of John, corresponding more or less closely with the mention in Mt. 21:31*b*, 32 which follows upon the parable of the Repentant Younger Son.

But, as more than one critic has noticed, the formation of the triad of parables in Lk. 15 is more likely to be editorial than primary. As Wernle observes

Chapter 15 is composed by Lk. for the justification of the publicans and sinners. Hence the introduction, ver. 1 f., which according to Lk.'s idea is adapted to all three parables.<sup>27</sup>

Streeter in his essay on "The Original Extent of  $\mathbb{Q}$ " in *Oxford Studies* likewise notes as probably editorial the arrangement in Lk. 14:7-15:32 of (*a*) three sayings on banquets (*b*) three sayings on the cost of following Christ (*c*) three parables on God's readiness to forgive sinners. As against the well-known  $\mathbb{Q}$  phenomenon of the pairing of parables Streeter writes

It is quite clear that we are in contact with a case of conscious arrangement: is this due to St. Luke or to his source? Or did Lk. find them in his sources as pairs, and by his additions make them into triads?

<sup>26</sup> See the forthcoming article in *Expositor*.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 100.

For we notice that each triad of sayings will split into a pair closely located, with a third less closely connected, i. e.

14: 7-11 + 12-14 and 15-24.

14: 28-34 + 31-33 and 26-27.

15: 3-7 + 8-10 and 11-32.

In chapter 14 we have already found occasion to retain the third member of the first triad as standing in its original place, the two preceding elements having been prefixed by  $\mathfrak{A}$ . If without attempting as yet to differentiate between  $\mathfrak{A}^S$  and  $\mathfrak{A}^{Lk}$  we follow the same method in chapter 15 we shall not only find a correspondence with the sequence of Mt., as already shown, but will find that the prefixed parable-pair on the Lost Sheep and Lost Coin really gain in significance by removal. For intrinsically this pair are not adapted to the support of Jesus' *message* of grace to the repentant, but to the defense of his *conduct* in associating with the outcast. The parable of the Repentant Younger Son attaches by intrinsic affinity to the story of the Penitent Harlot (7:36-50). Like the parable of the Two Debtors (7:41 f.) it defends the glad tidings proclaimed to the poor. The parables of the Lost Sheep and Lost Coin attach intrinsically to the story of Zacchaeus (19:1-10) ending with Jesus' reply to the Pharisees who murmured "He is gone in to lodge with a man that is a sinner." It defends the preacher's mode of approach:

The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.

If we defer for the present the question to what original connection should be assigned the two prefixed parables, of which only that of the Lost Sheep (15:3-7) is paralleled in Mt. (Mt. 18:12-14), and continue to trace up the Last-first sequence in Lk., it will be apparent that 16:1-13 takes the reader quite off the train of thought; for the only connection of the Unfaithful Steward with the Prodigal Son is that both wasted the householder's goods. The appended *logia* in 16:10-13 seem in fact to take this as the real point, or else to be appended purely *ad vocem* "mammon." We may also take the clause of ver. 14 "who were lovers of money" (a complete libel on the Pharisees, who made almsgiving the queen of virtues) as a touch of redactional adjustment. Let us then remove 16:1-13 and the editorial clause "who were lovers of money." At once the theme Last-first comes again to the surface. Ver. 14 ff. connects with the



parable of the Prodigal. The "scoffing" of the Pharisees could not really be evoked by the teaching of 16:1-13 on laying up "treasure that faileth not" in "the eternal tabernacles"; for no teaching could be more congenial to Pharisaism. The scoffing can only appear psychologically probable if we take as its real object Jesus' message to the penitent outcasts. Let it come after the parable of the Repentant Younger Son (especially if we may venture to insert the Matthean elements which fail to appear at this point in Lk., such as the parable of the Discontented Laborers and the utterance preferring the Penitent Publicans and Harlots to the Pharisees) and the "scoffs" become intelligible. Not only so; Jesus' reply to it becomes also intelligible. For he does not take his opponents to task for avarice, but for *self-righteousness*.

And he said unto them, Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God.

Many have been the critics who anticipate Moffatt in the verdict that at this point (16:15) "18:9-14 would follow better" than after 18:8. It is quite true that intrinsically 18:9-14, the parable of the self-justifying Pharisee and the Penitent Publican, belongs to this connection. But it is not the whole truth. We may also affirm that the succeeding context of this Rebuke to the Pharisees (16:14 f.), the  $\textcircled{Q}$  *logion* on Entering the Kingdom by Violence (16:16), belongs to the  $\textcircled{Q}$  sequence; for the Matthean parallel (Mt. 11:12-14) proves this also a part of the Defense of the Penitent Publicans and Sinners.

Mt. and Lk. thus agree in connecting references to the Repentance of the Masses at the Preaching of John (Mt. 21:31<sup>b</sup>-32 = Lk. 7:29 f.) with Jesus' Defense of the Publicans and sinners. In Lk. we find the Incident and Parable of the Penitent Harlot appended in 7:36-50 to Jesus' comparison of his own ministry of grace with John's and defense of his Association with the Outcasts (7:24-35).  $\mathfrak{A}$ 's recast of the reference to the Penitent Masses (7:29 f.) has been thrust into the midst of this<sup>28</sup> while the saying on Entering the Kingdom by Violence since John (Lk. 14:16 = Mt. 11:12-14) is reserved for the Last-first sequence, following almost immediately the parable of the

<sup>28</sup> Art. II, p. 118.

Penitent Younger Son. In Mt. the parable of the Younger Son is followed immediately by the reference to the Penitent Masses (Mt. 21:28-32), while the *logion* is connected with the Defense of the Ministry of Grace.

The theme of the ¶ parable of the Rich man in Hades (Lk. 16:19-31) is still quite obviously that introduced in 13:22-30—the Last become first; but the interjection in 17 f. of two *logia* on the permanent validity of the law, and the sanctity of marriage, constitutes another interruption. Fortunately we have seen enough of the evangelist's method in earlier sections to appreciate the reason. The insertion may be attributed with great probability to the parantinomian caution of ¶ already exhibited in 14:25-35. Ver. 17 is manifestly attached to the radical saying "The law and the prophets were until John" (ver. 16), for the same reason that Mt. attaches the same *logion* in 5:17-20. Ver. 18 goes a step further in employing the *logion* on Divorce (Mk. 10:1-12 = Mt. 19:3-9 = 5:31 f.) to contrast the strictness of Christian teaching with the laxity of the Pharisees. ¶<sup>Lk.</sup> considers the indissolubility of the conjugal relation set forth in Mk. 10:1-12 and I Cor. 7:10 to be Christian, divorce Pharisaic. The Mosaic basis of scribal enactment (Mk. 10:3-5) is simply (and very characteristically) cancelled. The Last-first theme continues at least to 16:25, if not to the end of the chapter.

It is with 17:1-19 that we encounter the chief difficulties in endeavoring to follow up the Last-first theme to its ending. Is it to be assumed to come to a close with the Eschatology of 17:(20 f.) 22-37; or are some of the fragmentary and disconnected elements of 17:1-19 to be attributed to the source as part of this pragmatic sequence?

The closeness of the relation of the group of sayings on the Day of the Son of Man (Lk. 17:22-37) to the parable of the Rich Man in Hades (16:19-31) and its real function as a wind-up of the Last-first series, is obscured by several minor redactional changes as well as by additions both before and after. Of these we must speak only to such extent as may serve clearly to disengage the underlying source-connection, leaving for later treatment the question of the derivation and interrelation of the interjected or appended material.

At first sight the problem of accounting for the tangle of sayings and incidents in Lk. 17:1-19 seems hopeless. Moffatt

designates 16:1-17:10 "a loose collection of sayings upon various social relationships."<sup>29</sup> To A. Wright 17:1-10 consists of "four disconnected logia." Soltau holds to a theory of accidental displacement of leaves. According to his view 17:3-4 continues chapter 15, verses 1-2 and 5-6 being insertions from Mt., made by transcribers of the text (!).<sup>30</sup> Other attempts to find a logical relation are even more unsatisfactory.

The first two of the "four disconnected logia" on Stumbling the Weak (17:1 f. = Mt. 18:6 f. = Mk. 9:42 f.) and Forgive thy Brother (17:3 f. = Mt. 18:21 f.) are found in the same antithetic relation in Mt., separated from one another only by a short section from Mk. (Mt. 18:8 f. = Mk. 9:43-47). This interconnection may therefore be attributed to the common source. In Mt. the theme appears greatly expanded including the  $\Phi$  parable of the Lost Sheep (Mt. 18:12-14 = Lk. 15:4-7) and another parable peculiar to Mt. on the Unforgiving Servant (18:21-35). The example of Lk. 16:18 in comparison with Mk. 10:1-12 should at least warn us of the possibility of condensation on Lk.'s part. But were the section long or short in the source, why should Lk. introduce it here?

If we fall back on merely verbal resemblances it is possible to imagine the two sayings as having been attached after the parable on the Rich Man in Hades because the series which the parable concludes is also a defense of the "little ones"; moreover there is mention in the appendix to the parable (ver. 26-31) of five "brethren" who are to be brought, like the "brother" of 17:3 f., to "repentance" and "repentance" occurs again in 17:4 and 5 as the object to be gained. Again the penalty for stumbling the weak in 17:2 is that the offender be "thrown into the sea," and this fate more or less recalls that of the sycamine tree of ver. 6 f., especially if the variant forms of this  $\Phi$  logion in Mk. 11:22 = Mt. 21:21 = 17:20 be also borne in mind; for in Mt.-Mk. it is a mountain that is "thrown into the sea" by the power of faith. Such connections *ad vocem*, trifling as they seem, are in reality very common in Lk.

But even *ad vocem* connection fails at the fourth *logion* in 17:7-10. As Plummer justly remarks

<sup>29</sup> *Introd.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 273.

<sup>30</sup> *Z. ntl. Wiss.*, X (1909), pp. 230-238.

The attempts to find a connection between this and the preceding saying are poor and unsatisfactory.

The only appropriateness it seems possible to imagine for its editorial setting is that ver. 10 with its reference to "all the things that have been commanded you" would form a suitable close to a series of precepts such as might be deemed to form the bulk of the Great Interpolation down to this point. Inasmuch as after the incident of the Samaritan Leper (17:11-19) only the Eschatology (17:20-18:8) and a closing parable remain, it is conceivable that the position occupied by 17:7-10 might be due to this backward look of ver. 10, and the parantinomian interest of **℔**.

Intrinsically, however, the parable treats of the Thanklessness of Servile Toil. Moreover, unique as it is, its teaching has close intrinsic affinity with some of the **Θ** material. The point of the question "Doth he thank<sup>31</sup> the servant because he did the things that were commanded?" is very close to that of the Sermon on the Higher Righteousness, "What thank have ye?" (τίνα χάριν ἔχετε). The contrast really intended is like that of Jn. 15:14 f. between the service of slaves and sons. It is the distinction of the Jewish teachers between *Kedushah* and *Chasiduth*, the righteousness of holiness and the righteousness of goodness. The parable expounds the doctrine of "grace," and expounds it in a defensive sense against those who stand for legality. It forms thus a true pendant to the Matthean parable of the Discontented Laborers (Mt. 20:1-16) and forms a logical link in Jesus' defense of his doctrine of forgiveness and grace. The defense, however, is aggressive, and consists of a counter-attack upon the legalistic ideal. Now we have already noted how in Mt. the parable of the Discontented Laborers is explicitly told in support of the principle Last-first (Mt. 19:30; 20:16). Moreover mere subtraction from Mt. of the intervening Markan material leaves this parable to be automatically followed by (1) the parable of the Penitent Younger Son (Mt. 21:28-30), (2) the reference to the Penitent Masses (21:31 f. = Lk. 7:29 f.). Further still we have already found strong reason for identifying fundamentally the Matthean parable of the Penitent Younger Son with the Lukan (Lk. 15:11-32), which

<sup>31</sup> Note the *ad vocem* connection with ver. 16, "giving him thanks."

was uttered, like the Matthean, in defense of "the publicans and sinners" who "were drawing near unto him for to hear him." Finally we have also had occasion to observe a disposition on the part of  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$  to soften the anti-legalism of the source; for he leaves a mere remnant in 16:16 of the radical utterance more fully conveyed in Mt. 11:12-14. If, then, we now reconstitute from the Matthean parallels the original context of the saying on John's opening "by violence" the doors of the kingdom we shall find it to include the following:

- a Penitent Younger Son, Mt. 21:28-30 = Lk. 15:11-32.
- b Penitent Masses, Mt. 21:31 f. = Lk. 7:29 f.
- c Pharisaic self-righteousness, Lk. 16:14 f.; 18:9-14.
- d John forces the doors of the Kingdom, Lk. 16:16 = Mt. 11:12 f.

This sequence furnishes (as  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Mt.}}$  has perceived) a parallel to Mk. 11:27-33, to which he attaches his  $\mathfrak{Q}$  version of the appeal to "the baptism of John" as constituting the great "sign of the times." It is to such a context that we should naturally resort if seeking a connection for the antilegalistic utterance of Lk. 17:7-10. That  $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$  should remove it from after 16:16 to a slightly later position, substituting the parantinomian *logia* of 16:17, 18, and that he should give it a place where "all the things commanded you" would seem to look back over the series of teachings embodied in the Greater Interpolation, is no more than we ought to expect of an evangelist whose avoidance of "anti-Pharisaic material" has been frequently observed.

With the rubric of 17:11a and the ensuing incident of the Samaritan Leper (17:11b-19) we reach another of the milestones of the Peraean Journey. Relation of the incident to the preceding there is (intrinsically) none. The usual *ad vocem* relation of  $\mathfrak{R}$ 's connections may perhaps be found in the "thanks" rendered by the "stranger" though neglected by the Jews, and the thanklessness of the servile relation (*cf.* verses 9 and 16). With or without this superficial reminder in ver. 16 the retrospect in ver. 10 over "all things commanded" might well suggest to the compiler of the "Travel-document of the Lukan Gospel" that it is time his Longer Interpolation neared its close. With 13:22 he had begun a long parenthesis, introducing the Last-first theme of his source by sayings which look

forward to the gathering of believing Gentiles "from the east and the west, the north and the south" while the sons of the kingdom are cast out. Now he closes the parenthesis with a pendant to the opening anecdote of the Shorter Interpolation. Like the Believing Centurion, the Thankful Samaritan who "returned to give glory to God" puts to shame the thankless Jews of his company. In handling and in pragmatic application the  $\Theta$  incident and that of  $\mathfrak{H}^{\text{Lk.}}$  are identical. The basis of the story may well be the same as the Markan taken over in 5:12-16(= Mk. 1:40-45). If so it is the more unlikely that the special development is that of  $\mathfrak{H}^{\text{Lk.}}$  Mt., as we should certainly anticipate, has given no room to the Thankful Samaritan; but he admits the Believing Centurion, *including the pragmatic application*. We are here concerned, however, only with the motive of  $\mathfrak{H}^{\text{Lk.}}$  for locating the story at this point, and the motive cannot well be any special geographical or historical information of his own. On the contrary the implied situation ("passing between<sup>32</sup> Samaria and Galilee") is one which should carry us back to the very outset, where the border of Galilee and Samaria is crossed at 9:51 f. The geographical datum of 17:11b merely means that the group of nine Jews and one Samaritan is taken by  $\mathfrak{H}^{\text{Lk.}}$  to imply a location on the border of Jesus' usual field of healing activity. Ver. 11a is the editorial rubric, supplementing 11b, as 12:1a supplements 11:53 f.  $\mathfrak{H}^{\text{Lk.}}$  has not composed, but compiled. This appears from locutions of a type familiar to us in  $\mathfrak{H}^{\text{Lk.}}$  (note the address "Jesus" as compared with 23:42 and the emphasis on "giving glory to God" 15, 18 as compared with 2:20; 5:26; 7:16, 29; 13:13). To  $\mathfrak{H}^{\text{Lk.}}$  the anecdote owes little more than its present location. In any case we have no reason to suppose that in the source it interrupted the sequence of thought between the parable of the Rich Man in Hades and the Eschatology of 17:(20 f.) 22-37. For in reality this relation is very close.

It is true that the appendix to the parable beginning "And beside all this" (*ἐν τοῦτοις πᾶσι*, ver. 26; cf. 24:21) is of the nature of a redactional supplement unconnected with the intrinsic teaching. But while this supplement has no close connection with the parable to which it has become attached, it has a close and important relation to the context both preceding and fol-

<sup>32</sup> On this rendering see Plummer, *Intern. Crit. Comm.*, *ad loc.*

lowing. Moreover this relation is none of  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$ 's making, but is rather violated by him.

The appendix to the parable of the Rich Man in Hades (16:26-31) deals like the saying on Entering the Kingdom by Violence (16:16) with the Jewish expectation of the Coming of Elias to effect the Great Repentance. It is in substance a denial of this Jewish expectation of the return of Elias from Paradise to prepare Israel for the Day of the Son of Man, and is meant to throw back the Jewish objector with his demand, "How then doth not Elias first come" (Mk. 9:11), on the *written* testimony of Moses and the prophets as in Jn. 5:33-47. If, then, this addition be not a primary element, it is at least so early a supplement to the parable, as to fall fully in line with the course of thought of which the parable forms part; and this is no other than the theme which we have followed throughout under the designation Last-first. Not only so. If this reference to the apocalyptic expectation of the Coming of Elias to effect the Great Repentance looks back in its original connection to the group of sayings we have found reason to place immediately before the parable, the group centering upon the utterance regarding "the law and the prophets" as no longer availing since the baptism of John, it also looks forward to the Eschatology (17:22-37); for the central theme of the Eschatology is the hopelessness of escape from the Day of the Son of Man. The intervening material of 17:1-19 is thus excluded. The present arrangement, then, is not that contemplated by the Last-first sequence. The interjected anecdote of the Samaritan Leper is a premature conclusion. The original course of thought proceeds from the sayings on Elias and the Law to the Eschatology. It remains to be seen what traces of redaction are observable in this final section of the Greater Interpolation.

The connection of the two verses 17:20 f. with the discourse on the Day of the Son of Man (17:22-37) is once more mainly *ad vocem* ("Lo, here, or there"!; cf. "Lo, there! Lo, here!" ver. 23). The saying is prefixed to the discourse for the same reason that the parable of the Importunate Widow (18:1-8) is appended at the close. The final sentence of the parable in its present form: "Howbeit if the Son of man came<sup>33</sup> would

<sup>33</sup> On the correctness of this translation see Bacon, Expositor VIII, 46 (Oct., 1914) "Will the Son of Man find Faith on the Earth?"

he find the faith on the earth," is intended to explain the *delay of the Parousia*; and it explains it in the usual manner: The missionary propaganda must first be accomplished (*cf.* Mk. 13:10 and parallels, Acts 1:6-8). Jewish apocalypse has a parallel explanation: The number of the elect must first be completed (II Esdr. 4:35 f.; *cf.* Eth-En. xlvii. 4). In the midst of the discourse (17:25) a similar *caveat* is interjected

But first must he (the Son of man) suffer many things and be rejected of this generation.

This, however, is only an indication of editorial revision, to be classed with the alteration of "day of the Son of man" (*i. e.* of the intervention of God by His Judge and Redeemer) to "*one of the days* of the Son of man" in ver. 22, and the change from singular to plural ("days of the Son of man") in ver. 26.<sup>34</sup> *Per contra* the intrinsic motive of the discourse is closely akin to the eschatology of 12:35-13:9. There is no mitigation of the immediacy of the impending doom or deliverance. Thus framework and contents are somewhat at odds. In 17:20 f., 25, and 18:1-8 the question raised is that of the *delay* of the Parousia, and it is answered by deprecation of "observation" (*παράτηρησις*). The main discourse begins with a warning not to be deceived by the supposed signs which lead the multitude astray, but to be ever on the alert, free from the entangling cares of the world, which engulfed the contemporaries of Noah and brought destruction even to the wife of Lot. The force of this is not increased but weakened by prefixing a saying on the Coming being inward (17:20 f.), by interjecting a reference to the rejection by "this generation" (ver. 25), and by appending a parable which explains that even importunate prayer cannot advance the Day until "the faith" has been established on the earth. It has already been noted that intrinsically the parable of the Importunate Widow is not adapted to explain the delay of the Parousia, but rather belongs with the section on Effectual Prayer forming a close pendant to that of the Importunate Friend (11:5-8).

For the editorial revision and supplementation of the Eschatology 17:22-37 we cannot hold  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk}}$  individually responsible.

<sup>34</sup> We may also question the location of the  $\Theta$  *logion* 17:33 = Mk. 8:35 = Mt. 16:25 and 10:38. This, however, does not affect the tone.



The additions and transpositions may have preceded; for the motive is a common one, equally apparent *e. g.* in Mk. 13. The case is otherwise with the transfer of the parable of the Self-righteous Pharisee (18:9-14). The better connection of this parable with 16:15 is so patent as to have evoked repeated comment.<sup>35</sup> The real problem is to account for the transfer, and adequate motive can hardly be found outside the exigencies of  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$ , who here resumes the thread of Mk. at the point where our second evangelist contrasts those who receive the kingdom in the humility of little children and those who turn away because the sacrifice is too great (Mk. 10:13-31). The two anecdotes of the Little Children Received and the Rich Man who Turned Away are those with which Lk. resumes the course of Markan story in 18:15-30. A transfer of the parable of the Penitent Publican and Self-Righteous Pharisee to stand at the close of the Longer Interpolation introducing the Markan contrast would be not unnatural for  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$ . There would be all the more occasion if in addition the all too anti-legalistic tone of the paragraph on the Passing of the Law and the Prophets could by the transfer be further mitigated.

Our survey of connections in the Longer Interpolation is far from complete, but even now it is possible to distinguish two factors.  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$  has attempted no small amount of rearrangement, primarily in the interest of his Markan journey-scheme, but not without aims of practical edification and apologetic as well. Drastic as this reconstruction has been it has not sufficed wholly to obliterate a topical connection which from its deeper-lying position, its occasional coincidence with the order of parallel  $\mathfrak{Q}$  material in Mt.,<sup>36</sup> and its frequent violation by  $\mathfrak{A}^{\text{Lk.}}$ , we can but regard as older, if not the actual primary order of  $\mathfrak{S}$ . This almost purely topical sequence was easily destroyed; for its connections were of the loose character exemplified in Lk. 11:1, 53 f., 13:1, 10, 23; 17:11b. Whether among the anecdotes which Mt. does not reproduce, such as the Crooked Woman Healed (13:10-17), the Dropsical Man (14:1-6), the

<sup>35</sup> On the hopelessness of the present "stringing together" of Lk. 16:15-18 see *e. g.* Sir J. C. Hawkins, *Oxf. Stud.*, p. 124 note, and Streeter, *ibid.*, p. 201. Soltan, *Z. ntl. W.*, X, 3, p. 234 proposes to insert 18:9-14 after 16:15.

<sup>36</sup> Also with certain  $\mathfrak{Q}$  elements of Mk

Samaritan Leper (17: 11-19), Zacchaeus (19: 1-10) and the like, we have elements of **Σ** or fragments of another source or sources, oral or written, is a question which can be answered only after comprehensive consideration of **Π** and **℔** in Lk. In the same connection enquiry should be made whether the remarkable disruption of what we see reason to regard as the original topical order has come to pass through supplementation or by combination. Is it an effect of the insertion of individual *logia*, parables and incidents; or has it come to pass through the interweaving of a connected special source or sources? These questions still await an answer; but the most far-reaching of all concerns an arrangement which can hardly be due to any other hand than **℔**<sup>Lk.</sup>, and to this we must devote a closing word.

Between the discourse on Effectual Prayer (11: 1-13) and that on Wealth that Faileth Not (12: 13-34) **℔**<sup>Lk.</sup> inserts the Denunciations which in Mt. are found partly at the close of the Galilean ministry, partly at the close of the Judaeian (Mt. 11: 20-24; 12: 22-45 and ch. 23). The distribution by both evangelists is obviously determined by Mk., who has a collision in Galilee, with the "scribes from Jerusalem" in 7: 1-23 and another in Jerusalem in 12: 38-40. But Mt. and Lk. vary greatly in their distribution of the various elements of the **Θ** material.

On one point it is possible to speak with practical certainty. Mt. is certainly truer to the source in giving the citation from "the Wisdom of God" as a whole instead of in two parts, as Lk. does in 11: 49-51 and later in 13: 34 f. Moreover to place the whole where Mt. places it in 23: 34-39 as a warning to guilty Jerusalem, murderess of the prophets, that the day of her visitation is now past, and that her heavenly visitant (Wisdom in the source) will no more be seen of her until she welcomes messengers that come in the name of the Lord, greeting them with hosannahs, instead of abuse and murder, is far more in keeping with the sense in which in **Σ** the Wisdom citation must have been placed in the mouth of Jesus. It is his parting word to the unbelieving city, and looks forward to another Coming and a different reception.

Why then, has Lk. transferred the citation and the connected Woes on Scribes and Pharisees to Galilee (Lk. 11: 42-52), and

attached the lament, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets" &c. to Herod's Threat, ending "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem"? Not, of course, *merely* because of the *ad vocem* connection. Principally, no doubt, because the description in Mk. 11:1-10 of Jesus' triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, ending with the shout of the people,

Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord;  
Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David;  
Hosanna in the highest,

seemed to  $\mathfrak{L}^k$ . the fulfilment of the saying of Jesus "Ye shall not see me henceforth until ye shall say Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." If so, he could not allow the prediction to stand *after* its fulfilment. It *must* be connected with an earlier leave-taking, and this could only be the farewell to Galilee which in the Markan account follows upon a conflict with the Scribes (Mk. 7:1-23).  $\mathfrak{L}^k$ . connects it accordingly with the Collision with the Scribes in Capernaum and the Threat of Herod which in his other source was described as leading to Jesus' expulsion.

If this be the explanation of  $\mathfrak{L}^k$ . 's singular placing of 11:49-51 and 13:34 f. it throws light also upon the arrangement of the adjoining material, which was seen to interrupt the topical order. This applies to the whole Denunciation and Eschatology of 11:14-12:12 linked together, as we have seen, by the apologetic and practical interest of  $\mathfrak{L}^k$ . It applies as well to the further nexus of 12:13-13:21; for, as already noted,  $\mathfrak{L}^k$ . merely makes of 12:13-33 a convenient supplement to his exhortation to Watchfulness, begun at 12:1-12, and continued in 12:35-13:21. In like manner we may judge from the insertion of the Lament in 13:34 f. at this point in the Peraean Journey that to  $\mathfrak{L}^k$ . it interprets the group which lay before him in the form of a series of teachings on the theme Last-first, and which he adjusts to his own conception of the 'order.'